



#### REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Official Action dated April 30, 2004. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

#### Status of the Claims

Claims 1-8 are under consideration in this application. Claims 1-8 are being amended, as set forth above and in the attached marked-up presentation of the claim amendments, in order to more particularly define and distinctly claim Applicant's invention.

#### Additional Amendments

The claims are being amended to correct formal errors and/or to better disclose or describe the features of the present invention as claimed. Applicant hereby submits that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

#### Status of Related US Applications

As shown in the attached PAIR print-outs, the related US App. No. 10/222,831 has been allowed, although the Patent Office has not yet mailed out its Notice of Allowance. US App. No. 10/212,882 was described to be related to US App. No. 10/222,831 on page 1 of the specification thereof, and it was IFW TSS processed by the Tech Center on May 11, 2004; however, its claims are totally different from the current invention.

#### Double Patenting Rejection

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1-8 under judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of the co-pending US Application No. 10/222,831. A terminal disclaimer has been filed along with the amendment to obviate the rejection. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the outstanding double patenting rejection is in order, and is therefore respectfully solicited.

Allowable Subject Matters


Claims 1-8 would be allowed if the double patenting rejections could be overcome. As the double-patenting rejection is obviated, the claims are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of all the above, clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art reference upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely, Applicant respectfully contends that the prior art references cannot anticipate the present invention or render the present invention obvious. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Stanley P. Fisher  
Registration Number 24,344

---

Juan Carlos A. Marquez  
Registration Number 34,072

**REED SMITH LLP**  
3110 Fairview Park Drive  
Suite 1400  
Falls Church, Virginia 22042  
(703) 641-4200

**July 30, 2004**

SPF/JCM/JT